

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Nicholas K. Eib, etal. )  
 ) Group Art Unit: 1756  
 )  
 ) Examiner: Deborah Checko-Davis  
Serial No.: 10/825,342 )  
 ) Atty. Docket No.: 03-1810  
Filed: April 14, 2004 )  
 )  
For: OPTIMIZED MIRROR DESIGN )  
FOR OPTICAL DIRECT WRITE )  
 )  
 )

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 11 2006**

**RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL ACTION**  
**Restriction/Election Requirement**

Hon. Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This response is presented to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2006, wherein the Examiner required restriction pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §121. Election is hereby made, *with traverse*, to prosecute Group I, i.e., method claims 1-10, 13-20.

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of the restriction is respectfully requested. Restriction is not required by 35 U.S.C. §121, as suggested in the Office Action. Congress wisely granted the *discretion* to restrict applications. According to 35 U.S.C. §121 "... the Commissioner *may* require the application to be restricted...." (emphasis added).

Furthermore, MPEP § 803 lists two criteria that must be present for restriction to be proper:

- 1) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
- 2) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required.

In searching the Group I claims, the class and subclass for the Group II claims will undoubtedly be searched, to ensure that no relevant art is overlooked. For this reason, there is no significant burden on the examiner, and certainly no serious burden as required by MPEP §121.